

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA COLUMBIA DIVISION

FIRST PRIORITY, INC.,	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
VS.	§	
	§	Civil Action No. 3:21-02801-MGL
MCC SOLUTIONS, LLC; CONNECTINC	§	
GLOBAL MANAGEMENT, LLC; and	§	
DOUGLAS LAMBERT,	§	
Defendants.	§	

ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION AND GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Plaintiff First Priority, Inc. (First Priority), filed a complaint against Defendants MCC Solutions, LLC, Connectinc Global Management, LLC (collectively, the Corporate Defendants), and Douglas Lambert (Lambert), alleging breach of contract. Lambert and the Corporate Defendants brought counterclaims for tortious interference with contract and inference with contractual relationships, as well as breach of contract.

The Clerk's Office previously filed an entry of default against Corporate Defendants, and the Court dismissed their counterclaims with prejudice.

This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge recommending the Court grant First Priority's motion for partial summary judgment as to Lambert's counterclaims. The Report was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The Magistrate Judge filed the Report on June 9, 2023. To date, Lambert has failed to file any objections.

"[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation." *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note). Moreover, a failure to object waives appellate review. *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 845–46 (4th Cir. 1985).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case under the standard set forth above, the Court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein. Therefore, it is the judgment of the Court First Priority's motion for partial summary judgment is **GRANTED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed this 29th day of June 2023, in Columbia, South Carolina.

s/ Mary Geiger Lewis
MARY GEIGER LEWIS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this Order within thirty days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.